REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are currently pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 11, 18, and 30-35 have been amended, without acquiescence or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29, 34-36, 47, 48 and 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcy (US Patent: 6,662,342 B1), in view Upton, IV (US Patent 6,742,054 B1). Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10-12, 14, 21, 30, 31-33, 37-38, 40, 42-43, 45, 56, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcy in view of Dreyband et al (US Patent Application: US 2001/0029604 A1) and Upton. Claims 15-17, 57, 58 and 61-62 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcy, Upton, IV, and Dreyband et al in view of Wan (US Patent: 2003/0233618 A1). Claims 25-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcy, Upton, IV, in view of Wan. Claims 5-7, 9, 13, 39, 41, 44, 46, 55 and 59 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcy, Upton, IV, and Dreyband et al in view of JAXB (Sun Microsystems, pages 58, and 74, published: January 8, 2003).

Amended claim 18 recites the following limitations "storing the data in a database" and "determining one or more access parameters for the child node relative to the parent node in accordance with the schema, wherein the at least one access parameter allows the named access procedure to have direct access to an instance of the child node in the data stored in a column of the database for the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema" (Emphasis Added). Claims 1, 11, and 30-35 recite similar limitations. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Marcy does not disclose or suggest determining one or more access parameters for the child node relative to the parent node in accordance with the schema. Upton does not remedy the deficiencies present in Marcy.

1.   First, Applicants note that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Applicants respectfully submit that Upton does not disclose one or more access parameters for the child node relative to the parent node that allows the named access procedure to have direct access to an instance of the child node in

12

the data stored in a column of the database for the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema.

Upton is directed toward transforming input message data from a first application into an output message accepted by a second application (Upton, Abstract, Col. 6 lines 28-40). Upton discloses that an iterator steps through the array of the input message data and transforms the input message data into an output message (Upton, Figure 5).

Upton discloses the storage of message data in an array and that an iterator steps through the array of data to create the output message. Upton is silent with respect to storing message data in a database, much less accessing a child node in the data stored in a column of the database. Instead, Upton explicitly discloses storing message data in an array to allow an iterator to step through the data, and does not disclose accessing data stored in a column of the database. Thus, Upton does not disclose one or more access parameters for the child node relative to the parent node that allows the named access procedure to have direct access to an instance of the child node in the data stored in a column of the database for the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema

2.   Next, Amended claim 18 recites the following limitations "determining one or more access parameters for the child node relative to the parent node in accordance with the schema, wherein the at least one access parameter allows the named access procedure to have direct access to an instance of the child node in the data stored in a column of the database for the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema" (Emphasis Added). Applicants respectfully submit that Upton does not disclose at least one access parameter allows the named access procedure to have direct access to the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema.

Upton is directed toward transforming an input message to an output message with the use of iterators (Upton, Abstract, Figure 5). Iterators are associated with sequences and are used to determine the processing of elements of a sequence (Upton, Column 12, lines 63-65). Field data (e.g. customer.address.city, the city field of an address container) is referenced based upon the current position of the relevant iterators (Upton, Column 27, line 50 - Column 28 line 17).

13

Applicants respectfully submit that Upton discloses an iterator to iterate and access all elements. Upton discloses the opposite of a named access procedure to have direct access to the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema. Upton is directed toward the transforming of an input message and specifically relies on an iterator in the cited sections to iterate through and process the sequences of elements in an input message. Thus, Upton does not disclose at least one access parameter that allows the named access procedure to have direct access to the child node without progressive traversal of a hierarchy of nodes defined in the schema.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 and its dependent claims are allowable over Marcy, Upton, and their combination.

3.   Claims 1, 11, and 30-35 recite similar limitations as claim 18. Therefore, these claims and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Marcy, Upton, the cited references, and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

If the Commissioner determines that additional fees are due or that an excess fee has been paid, the Patent Office is authorized to debit or credit (respectively) Deposit Account No. **50-4047**, billing reference no. **7035732001**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 29, 2008

By: _Gerald Chan_
Gerald Chan
Registration No.: 51,541
for
Peter C. Mei
Registration No.: 39,768

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4400
Telefax: (650) 849-4800

15